



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/804,932	03/13/2001	Ravindra K. Shetty	H0001595 (256.092US1)	1920

128 7590 04/01/2003

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.
101 COLUMBIA ROAD
P O BOX 2245
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/804,932

Applicant(s)
Shetty

Examiner
Etienne P LeRoux

Art Unit
2171



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on Mar 13, 2001 is/are a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2171

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 recites "such that the transformed unique numerical representation does not result in multiple similar numerical representations." One of ordinary skill in the art is not able to make and use the invention as it is unclear what comprises "unique numerical representation" and what comprises "similar numerical representation." For purposes of this office action, examination examiner will ignore "similar numerical representations."

Art Unit: 2171

Claim 1 recites "to avoid ambiguous prediction of meaning of the translated words in the received text." One of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to make and use the invention as it is unclear how Applicant "translates" a word. For purposes of this Office Action, examiner will assume that "translating" is identical to "transforming"

Claim 8 is rejected for including language similar to claim 1.

Claims 2-7 and 9-12 are rejected for being dependent from a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPAT 3,645,015 issued to Pfeiffer (hereafter Pat '015), as best examiner is able to ascertain.

Regarding claim 1, Pat '015 discloses:

receiving a text including multiple words

transforming each of the received words into a unique numeral representation

such that the transformed unique numerical representation does not result in multiple similar numerical representations [col 1, line 62 through col 2, line 25].

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 1, examiner maintains "to avoid ambiguous prediction of meaning of the translated words in the received text" is drawn to intended use and is the objective of the claimed invention. Supra limitation will not be given patentable weight.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPAT 5,892,470 to Kusnick (hereafter Pat '470), as best examiner is able to ascertain.

Regarding claim 1, Pat '470 discloses:
receiving a text including multiple words [col 2, line 55]
transforming [col 4, lines 1-27] each of the received words into a unique numeral representation such that the transformed unique numerical representation does not result in multiple similar numerical representations

Regarding claim 1, examiner maintains "to avoid ambiguous prediction of meaning of the translated words in the received text" is drawn to intended use and is the objective of the claimed invention. Supra limitation will not be given patentable weight.

Regarding claim 2, Pat '470 discloses receiving the text from a database [Fig 1, 101, col 2, lines 30-34 and col 3, lines 1-5]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2171

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPAT 5,892,470 issued to Kusnick (hereafter Pat '470) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of USPAT 6,502,091 issued to Chundi et al (hereafter Pat '091), as best examiner is able to ascertain.

Regarding claim 3, Pat '470 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention except for a keyword and morphologizing a key word. Pat '091 discloses a keyword [col 2, line 54] and morphologizing a key word [col 1, lines 39-49]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pat '470 to include a keyword and morphologizing a key word as taught by Pat '091 for the purpose of relating user queries and documents and furthermore for the purpose of computing word relationships by means of reducing words to common roots [col 1, lines 44-48 and col 2, lines 50-54].

Regarding claim 4, Pat '470 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention except for filtering to remove rarely used words. Pat '091 discloses removing rarely used words [col 2, lines 50-61]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pat '470 to include removing rarely used words as taught by Pat '091 for the purpose of locating documents relevant to a user's information needs from a collection of documents [col 1, lines 15-37].

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 5, Pat '470 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention except for text mining. Pat '091 discloses text mining [abstract]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pat '091 to include text mining as taught by Pat '091 for the purpose of receiving user queries and generating information retrieval sessions [abstract].

Regarding claim 6, Pat '470 discloses natural language [col 2, line 55].

Regarding claim 8, Pat '470 discloses an analyzer to transform each of the morphologized words to a unique numerical representation such that the transformed unique numerical representation does not result in multiple similar representations, to avoid ambiguous prediction of meaning of the translated words in the received text [col 4, lines 1-27]

Regarding claim 8, Pat '470 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention except for a web server. Pat '091 discloses a web server [abstract]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pat '470 to include a web server as taught by Pat '091 for the purpose of being able to locate documents via the Internet.

Regarding claim 8, Pat '470 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention except for a keyword and morphologizing a key word. Pat '091 discloses a keyword [col 2, line 54] and morphologizing a key word [col 1, lines 39-49]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pat '470 to include a keyword and morphologizing a key word as taught by Pat '091 for the purpose of relating user

Art Unit: 2171

queries and documents and furthermore for the purpose of computing word relationships by means of reducing words to common roots [col 1, lines 44-48 and col 2, lines 50-54].

Regarding claim 9, Pat '470 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention except for filtering to remove rarely used words. Pat '091 discloses removing rarely used words [col 2, lines 50-61]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pat '470 to include removing rarely used words as taught by Pat '091 for the purpose of locating documents relevant to a user's information needs from a collection of documents [col 1, lines 15-37].

Regarding claim 10, Pat '470 discloses the essential elements of the claimed invention except for text mining. Pat '091 discloses text mining [abstract]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pat '091 to include text mining a taught by Pat '091 for the purpose of receiving user queries and generating information retrieval sessions [abstract].

Regarding claim 11, Pat '470 discloses natural language [col 2, line 55].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne (Steve) LeRoux whose telephone number is (703) 305-0620.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached at (703) 308-1436.

Serial Number: 09/804,932

Page 8

Art Unit: 2171

Any inquiry of a general nature relating to the status of this application or processing procedure should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Etienne LeRoux

March 26, 2003



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100